



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/822,186 03/20/97 RUEGER

D CRP-137

EXAMINER

HM12/0412

TESTA, HIRWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON MA 02110


ROMEO, D
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1646
DATE MAILED:

18
04/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 08/822,186 | Applicant(s) Rueger et al. | |
| | Examiner David S. Romeo | Group Art Unit 1646 |  |

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-27-99

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-33, 35, and 36 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-25, 31-33, 35 and 36, drawn to a composition comprising an osteogenic
5 protein, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 26-30, drawn to a method of inducing bone or cartilage formation,
classified in class 514, subclass 12.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be
10 distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as
claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed
can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the
instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of inducing the
formation of dentine.

15 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate
status in the art as shown by their different classification, require separate searches and have

Art Unit: 1646

acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-16, 20-30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of osteogenic proteins comprising the species disclosed at page 28, full
5 paragraph 2, through page 29, full paragraph 1. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the
10 examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. Claims 1-12, 14-16, 18-30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of binding agents comprising the species disclosed at page 42, full
paragraph 1. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even
15 though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Art Unit: 1646

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. Claims 1-16, 18-30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably
5 distinct species of matrix comprising the species disclosed at the paragraph bridging pages 17-18. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct,
applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to
10 be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. Claims 1-26, 29-33, 35 and 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct
species comprising bone formation and cartilage formation. Applicant is required under 35
15 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct,
applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Art Unit: 1646

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species
5 of defect site comprising the species at page 15, line 1, through page 17, line 2, and/or in claim
29. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though
this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct,
applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to
10 be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the
examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission
may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an
election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37
15 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1646

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the
- 5 fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Romeo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4050. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:45 a.m. to 3:15 p.m.

5 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lila Feisee, can be reached on (703) 308-2731.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242.

Faxed draft or informal communications should be directed to the examiner at (703) 308-0294.

10 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


DAVID ROMEO
PATENT EXAMINER

April 10, 1999